

PRE-FIXATION FERMENTATION  
OF THE (ṚGVEDA) KRAMA-PĀṬHA

The opening *sūtra*-s of the *Krama-pāṭala*<sup>1</sup> and the *K(rama)-H(etu)-P(aṭala)*<sup>2</sup> reveal to us the *K(rama)-P(āṭha)* in its two aspects. The former places before us the mode of forming the *KP.* and also the unit fixed for it. To form the *KP.* of a hemistich — for that is the unit<sup>3</sup> for the formation of the *KP.* — one has to start by taking the opening pair of *pada*-s in it, thus making the first *Krama-varga* (or simply *varga*); and then form the next *varga* by taking the latter *pada* of the first and adding to it the next *pada* from the *Samhitā*. In this manner one should go on forming the *varga*-s, one after the other, until all the *pada*-s in the hemistich are exhausted. The *KP.* thus formed is to be rounded up by the *parigraha*<sup>4</sup> of the last *pada* of the unit. The opening *sūtra* of the *KHP* places before us the twofold purpose it is intended to serve. One is to place before the reader or reciter the two (namely, the *Sam.*- and the *P*) *pāṭha*-s simultaneously in one text for recital together; and secondly, to do it without any loss — even partial — of the *Samhitā*.

1. *kramo dvābhyām abhikramya pratyādāyottaraṁ tayoh / uttareṇopasaṁdadhyāt tathārdharcam samāpayet // RV.Prā. X.1. f.*

2. *athārṣyalopena yad āha sa kramah / samānakālāṁ padasaṁhitāṁ dvayoh // RV.Prā. XI.1.*

3. This is indicated by *tathārdharcam samāpayet* (s. note 1); *ardharcāntyaṁ ca RV.Prā. X.9*; and *saṁdhir nārdharcayor bhavet RV.Prā. X. 18*; and also *antabhāk* (= the final *pada* of the hemistich) included among the *parigrhya pada*-s. *RV.Prā. XI.25*. The *Upalekha-sūtra* further tells us that in the case of *ṛks* with three *pāda*-s, generally the first two *pāda*-s constitute the first hemistich; but in the case of 6.48.13; and 18; 7.66.16; 8.4.21; and 10.93.15, the first hemistich is constituted by the first *pāda* only. Naturally the remaining *pāda*-s make the remaining hemistich in all these. Cf. *tripadāsu ṛkṣu pūrvārdharcam dvipadam / uttarārdharcam tu pādām eva // bhardvājāya, dṛter iva, taccakṣur, vṛkṣās' cin me, adhūn nv atra, ity etāsāṁ pañcānāṁ pūrvapāda eva kuryāt // Upalekhasūtra III.6 f.*

4. This is a technical term meaning «repetition of a word with *iti* interpolated» (ABHYANKAR, *Dictionary of Sk. Grammar*). It corresponds to *sthitopasthita* defined in *RV.Prā. X.14*; also see *RV.Prā. XI.61*.

The idea of the device to combine the two *pāṭha*-s into one, keeping both intact, and thus combine their rewards into one, is as old as — possibly even much older than — the *Ait. Ār.*, where it has been mentioned in quite explicit terms<sup>5</sup>, along with the two *pāṭha*-s themselves. We have to note, however, that the names under which these *pāṭha*-s have been mentioned there, are quite different from those with which we are familiar. In fact, the names by which these *pāṭha*-s are referred to in the *Ait. Ār.* are quite unfamiliar; and we have to thank the commentator for the explanation<sup>6</sup> he has given us. The familiar terms *Samhitā*, *Pada*, and *Krama* are placed before us by the rather queer terms *Nirbhujā*, *Pratṛṇa*, and *Ubhayam-antareṇa*. They are well and briefly explained by the *vṛttikāra* in a *Kārikā* as follows:

*saṁdher vivartanaṁ nirbhujam vadanti /*  
*śauddhākṣarocāraṇaṁ ca pratṛṇam //*  
*ubhayaṁ vyāptam ubhayam-antareṇa /*  
*tathā kāmā anna-nākobhayākhyāḥ //*<sup>7</sup>

Here it has been quite explicitly declared that both (*ubhayam* = the *Samhitā* and the *Pada*- *pāṭha*-s) are covered by *ubhayam-antareṇa* (= the *Krama*-*pāṭha*). From this it is quite clear that the *KP.* (along with the *Sam.P.* and the *PP.*) is as old as (if not older than) the *Ait. Ār.* From this it is also clear that the *KP.* is a mode of recitation which combined in itself the other two *pāṭha*-s in their totality. How exactly this was or had been done in those ancient times, we seem to have no means to determine. But, fortunately, we have before us the evidence supplied by the two *pāṭala*-s, namely X and XI of the *RV.Prā.*, which appear to place before us, not so much the finished product in the form of the finalised *KP.*, but, what is more important, some indications of the *KP.* in the process of formation. We have here a feeling of being witnesses, as it were, to the diverse stages<sup>8</sup> through which the *KP.* must have gone, and to the various devices which must have come to be invented to overcome the diverse difficulties as they were experienced in the process.

The main aim of the *KP.* is, as is affirmed more than once by the *RV.Prā.*, to combine the two *pāṭha*-s, namely, the *Sam.* and the *P.* *pāṭha*-s, into one. And even here utmost care was taken to achieve *ārṣy-avilopa*<sup>9</sup> (the absence of *vilopa*, that is, complete presentation, of the *ārṣi sam-*

5. Read: *yat saṁdhiṁ vivartayati tan nirbhujasya rūpam atha yac chuddhe akṣare abhivyāharati tat pratṛṇasyāgra u evobhayamantareṇobhyaṁ vyāptam bhavati*, where *nirbhujā*, *pratṛṇa*, and *ubhayamantareṇa* stand for *samhitā*-, *pada*-, and *krama*- *pāṭha*-s respectively.

6. Read SĀYANA's comm. on the above cited passage.

7. *Vargadvaya* (*vṛtti*), st. 3 f. and *Vṛtti* on the same.

8. We rather have a feeling of witnessing a fermentation rather than well-marked stages of development.

9. For this see *RV.Prā.* XI.1; 58 f.; etc.

*hitā*) along with the *PP*. And the most primitive and probably the earliest step adopted for this purpose seems to have been what is found stated in: *krameta sarvāṇi padāni nirbruvan-n-iti hi smaranti*<sup>10</sup>. Accordingly, while forming the *varga*-s, all the *pada*-s (i.e. the initial *pada* from each *varga*) were to be subjected to *parigraha*. Thus, for example, the *KP* of *ā mandram ā vareṇyam* (9.65.29)<sup>11</sup> will be: *ā mandram / ety ā / mandram ā / mandram iti mandram / ā vareṇyam / ety ā /*, which will go on like this up to the end of the hemistich, to be rounded up with the *parigraha* of the last *pada* (of the hemistich).

A fractional remnant of this concept of *parigraha* may be seen in a later treatment accorded to this very passage in the *RV.Prā.* itself, as explained by Uvaṭa. *RV.Prā.* 10.10<sup>12</sup> has drawn a distinction between *ā* (nasalised *ā*), and *ā* (not nasalised), standing at the end of a *pāda*, or standing anywhere else except at the end. Thus here we have three cases (of *ā*) represented respectively by (i) *gabhīra a ugraputre* (8.67.11), (ii) *tanūṣv ā* (9.65.30), and (iii) *mandram ā vareṇyam* (9.65.29). The difference in the treatment of *ā* in these cases can easily be grasped by a glance through their respective *KP*-s, which run as follows:

- (i) *gabhīra a ugraputre / ety ā /*, where we have *trikrama* with nasalised *ā* as the *madhyama pada*, and *parigraha* of *ā*, of course, in its unnasalised form;
- (ii) *tanūṣv ā / ety ā /*, where we have no *trikrama*, but only the *parigraha* of *ā* (non-nasalised), because it is the last *pada* of the hemistich; and
- (iii) *mandram ā vareṇyam*, where we have *trikrama* only, but no *parigraha* (of the non-nasalised *ā*).

Soon, however, it seems, this mode of forming *KP*. was found or felt to be too cumbersome, and laborious, nay, at times even unnecessary or redundant. It appears, therefore, to have fallen into back-ground, though not to have been totally discarded, in favour of some new device. Remnants of this above-noted device, however, appear to have lingered on in a few cases.

One is what, in *RV.Prā.* XI.35, is called *yadṛccopanata*<sup>13</sup> *bahukrama* (= a *varga* of more than two *pada*-s or words, which cannot find sanction in the rules given in *RV.Prā.* X); while the other is where two or more circumstances calling for *trikrama* come in close succession<sup>14</sup>. The

10. *RV.Prā.* XI.62.

11. The *PP* of this will be: *ā / mandram / ā / vareṇyam /*

12. Read: *nākāraṁ prāḡ ato 'nūāsikam / RV.Prā.* X. 10; also read *araktasāṇ-dhyety apavādyate padāṁ pūnas tad uktvā 'dhyavasāya pūrvavat / RV.Prā.* XI.34.

13. Uvaṭa has explained this term in the following words: *nimittanaimittikaprasaṅgena yo bahukramāḥ kramaśāstreṣu nāmnātaḥ sa yadṛccopanataḥ*

14. Noticed in *RV.Prā.* XI.17 f.

former is illustrated<sup>15</sup> by *ā tvetā ni* (1.5.1), which is not covered by any of the general *Prā.* rules; and seems to call for *bahu-krama*. The PP. of this passage is given as: *ā / tu / ā / ita / ni /*; and the KP. as indicated by the *RV.Prā.* (and actually given by Uvaṭa) is: *ā tvetā ni / tvetā ni / etā ni / ita ni /*; the illustration of the other<sup>16</sup>, given by the *RV.Prā.* as the view adopted by Gārgya, is the case of *udū ṣu naḥ* (8.70.9), which in PP reads: *ut / ū iti / su / naḥ /*. Its KP., in Gārgya's opinion, is: *udū ṣu / ū ṣu naḥ /*. There are, however, two other alternative views held in this connection as stated by the *RV.Prā.* In the very passage cited above, it is stated, the final *pada*, namely *naḥ*, also has to be taken as not being fit to stand at the end of a *varga* (*anavasānīya*); and this makes all the difference. Thus the *Samh.*, we take here, will be: *udū ṣu ṇo vaso* (8.70.9); and the PP. will be: *ud / ū iti / su / naḥ / vaso iti /*. Here we shall have the KP. with fire *pada*-s<sup>17</sup> as: *udū ṣu ṇo vaso /*. The last alternative is the one adopted by the followers of Śākalya<sup>18</sup>. They treat this as a case of *catuḥ-krama* only; and give the KP. as *udū ṣu naḥ*.

As has been already noted above, every *pada* in the *Samhitā*, except the first, occurs twice in the KP. This leaves scope for ambiguity, in some cases at least, as regards its exact ending (that is, as a *pada*). Take, for example, *tāntvām* (1.49.4), where the first *pada*, if we go merely by *saṁdhi* rules, would appear to be either *tān* or *tām*, and thus remain doubtful. But a reference to the PP. will show that it must be *tām* and not *tān*. In such doubtful cases, *parigraha* is the device recommended and adopted by the *RV.Prā.* And hence the KP. of this passage would be: *tāntvām / tām iti tām /*<sup>19</sup>. But, it has to be noted that the *Prā.* does not intend to lay it down as an obligatory rule. It is only a permissive statement as is shown by: *adṛṣṭa-varṇe prathame codakāḥ syāt pravartakāḥ / etad iṣṭam /*<sup>20</sup>.

Ultimately, however, thinkers in this field appear to have hit upon the idea of, what the author of the *RV.Prā.* has designated by the comprehensive term, *bahukrama*. Ordinarily the *varga* of the KP. was to comprise only two *pada*-s. But sometimes it was found inconvenient to

15. See *RV.Prā.* XI.35.

16. For this read: *anantare trikramakāraṇe yadi tribhiś ca gārgyaḥ punar eva ca tribhiḥ /* *RV.Prā.* XI.17 and Uvaṭa's com. on it.

17. See *RV.Prā.* XI.18; and Uvaṭa on it.

18. *Catuḥkramas tv ācarito 'tra sākalaḥ /* *RV.Prā.* XI.19, and Uvaṭa on it.

19. Read: *adṛṣṭavarṇe prathame codakāḥ syāt pradārśakāḥ / etad iṣṭam /* *RV.Prā.* X.15; also read *RV.Prā.* XI.27, and Uvaṭa on both.

20. On this Uvaṭa remarks: *etat pradārśanam iṣṭam / kasmād iti na paṭhyate / iṣṭavacanād evāsyānityatvaṁ gamyate /* Also see *RV.Prā.* XI. 27.

place a *pada* at the end of a *varga*. In such cases the inconvenience was avoided by keeping the inconvenient *pada* intact in its place, and adding after it the next *pada* (from the *Saṁhitā*) as the final *pada* of the *varga*. Thus, in such cases, the *varga* would consist of not only two *pada*-s as usual, but of three *pada*-s. Similarly, at times, two or even three *pada*-s may have to be passed over, and the *pada* serially standing after them in the *Saṁ.* be made to occupy the last place in the *varga*. The *varga* in such cases would naturally comprise four or even five *pada*-s according to the number of *pada*-s passed over in each case. The *varga*-s with three, four, or five *pada*-s in them are designated *tri-*, *catuḥ-*, and *pañca-* *krama* respectively; while *bahu-krama*<sup>21</sup> came to be used as a common term for all of them.

But why should a *pāda* standing at the end of a *varga* be found inconvenient? Well, we may not enter here into all the intricate details<sup>22</sup> of this question. We shall rather peruse a few cases which may enable us to have some idea of the matter. Take, for example, the *Saṁhitā* text, *mo su naḥ* (1.38.6), which in *PP.* reads: *mo iti / su / naḥ /*<sup>23</sup>. Now looking to the two *pāṭha*-s and comparing them, we see that the *pada*-s *su* and *naḥ* are cerebralised in the *Śaṁ.P.*; and that is because of the influence in each case of the preceding *pada*. Thus *mo* is the cause of the cerebralisation (*nati*) of *su*; and this *su*, thus cerebralised into *ṣu*, becomes the cause of the *nati* of *naḥ* into *ṇaḥ*. In the *PP.*, each *pada*, being a separate unit by itself, stands uninfluenced by the *pada* preceding or succeeding it. Hence no problem arises regarding the changes caused in some *pada*-s by a *pada* preceding or succeeding them. But in the *Saṁ.* as also in the *KP.*, the *pada*-s cannot stand so isolated and uninfluenced. They are bound to be influenced by one another. And for an accurate view of these texts or *pāṭhas*-, it is quite necessary that the influenced and the influencing *pada*-s should go together in one and the same *varga*. But in the usual method of forming the *varga*-s, as we have already seen, every *pada* ordinarily has to stand at the end in one *varga*, and also at the beginning in the next *varga*. This means that ordinarily every *pada* has to (is expected to) stand at the end and the beginning of two successive *varga*-s respectively. But in cases like the one under consideration, this is found inconvenient, because, as a general

21. This term has been used in *RV.Prā.* XI.20, 25 and 35 to signify a (*krama*)-*varga* containing *bahu* (i.e. three or more) *pada*-s. In the *RV. KP.* we get *tri-*, *catuḥ-*, and *pañca-krama* only, beside the usual *dvikrama*.

22. For these see *RV.Prā.* X.34; XI.3-5; etc. and Uvaṭa on these.

23. For this see *RV.Prā.* X.8. Also see *RV.Prā.* XI.4. Elsewhere Uvaṭa has taken for illustration *ud ū su naḥ* (8.70.9) and pointed out how this has been treated differently by different authorities. For this see *RV.Prā.* XI.17-19.

rule<sup>24</sup>, the influencing *pada* cannot be separated from the influenced one; for, that would prevent the influenced *pada* from retaining its influenced or altered form; and thus the very purpose of the *KP* will be defeated. To turn to our present instance, if *mo* is removed from *ṣu* to another *varga*, the *ṣu* will inevitably be reduced to its original form, *su*; and if *ṣu* is reduced to *su*, it will lose its cerebralising influence, with the result that *naḥ* coming after it will not be cerebralised; and will remain *naḥ* only, as it is. Thus would crop up the loss of the *Sam.P.* or the *ārṣī saṁhitā* as it is very often called in the *RV.Prā.*

To avoid this difficulty, it has been decided by the designers of the *KP* that such *pada*-s will not stand at the end of a *varga*<sup>25</sup>. In other words this means that the influencing *pada* and the influenced one shall not be separated. The *RV.Prā.* XI.22 has clearly laid down that if there is no influence exercised by one *pada* over the other, one should follow the previously given (= the general) rule as given in *RV.Prā.* X.1 and XI.1. Otherwise, however, *bahukrama* will have to be adopted.

Let us take another illustration: *uṣā āvar tamaḥ* (1.92.4), which in the *PP.* reads: *uṣāḥ / āvar ity āvaḥ / tamaḥ /*. Here, why the *visarga* of *āvaḥ* is changed to *ṛ*, is not clear; and because of this doubt about this rhotacism of *visarga*, *āvaḥ* is prevented from standing at the end of a *varga*. Hence ultimately the *KP* of this passage has to be given as: *uṣā āvar tamaḥ / (āvar ity āvaḥ) /*.

There are, indeed, many such circumstances which require adoption of *bahu-krama*. But the general principle behind them all is the same, so much so that no further illustrations need be added<sup>26</sup>.

Let us now pass on to some cases of a contrary nature, such as *yad ado pito ajagan* (1.187.7), *so cin nu na marāti* (1.191.10), *uṣar va-sūyavaḥ* (1.49.4), and *nīcā taṁ dhakṣi* (4.4.4)<sup>27</sup>. In the case of these passages noticed by the *RV.Prā.*, it may be observed that they also contain the words *ado*, *so*, *uṣar*, *dhakṣi* and *dhukṣi*, which are similar to those which have been declared to be *anavasānīya*. Then, why is it that they are not prevented from standing at the end of a *varga*? Why are they treated like other ordinary *pada*-s, and allowed to stand at the end of a *varga*? The *RV.Prā.* appears to have given no answer to

24. The rule is given in *RV.Prā.* XI.22 as: *ayāvane pūrvavidhānam ācaret*; and is explained by Uvaṭa in the following words: *yatra krame vacanaprāptābhyāṁ padābhyāṁ pūrvapadaṁ nimittaṁ na bhavati tatrety uktam bhavati /* He further states the purport of this rule as: *yatra yatra yāvanam tatra tatra bahukramam ācaret /* Uvaṭa explains *ayāvana* to mean *amiśraṇa*, absence of close juxta-position (of a modifying *pada* with the modified *pada*). In the absence of such *yāvana*, one should follow the *pūrvavidhāna* (that is, the general rule stated before) and resort to *dvikrama* only.

25. Cf. *āvar tamaḥ*, *RV.Prā.* X.3, also *tamaḥparam rephanimittasamśayāt tathāvar ity etad apodyate padam / RV.Prā.* XI.7; and Uvaṭa on them both.

26. For these see *RV.Prā.* X.3, etc.; and corresponding *sūtras* in *RV.Prā.* XI.

27. For these see, *RV.Prā.* XI.8, and Uvaṭa on it.

this question. It is only Uvaṭa<sup>28</sup> who points out that these cases have not been noticed in the *anavasānīya* section of the *RV.Prā.* X. This, he means to say, is indication enough of their not being *anavasānīya*. This would mean that by the time when the *RV.Prā.*, or perhaps its *tenth paṭala*, was composed, the practical aspect of the *KP* was almost settled, though there were certain section in which optional practice in some respects was found to prevail without any possibility of reconciliation; and, therefore, had to be accepted as such<sup>29</sup>.

It is equally interesting to see how several of the rules about the *anavasānīya pada*-s, and the consequent phenomenon of *bahu-krama* itself, were not uniformly accepted in practice. Thus, for example<sup>30</sup>, *parīto śiñcata* (9.107.1) is considered to be a case of *trikrama*, because the preceding (*pada*), *pari*, is admitted as cerebralising the initial letter of the following *pada*, *śiñcata*, even though these two *pada*-s are intervened by the (*pada*) *ito*. But at the same time there were others<sup>31</sup>, who thought that the *okāra* of the immediately preceding *ito* is the cause of *ṣatva* in *śiñcati*. Hence, they argued, there is no scope for *trikrama* in this case. Thus the *KP* of this passage under consideration should be: *parītaḥ / ito śiñcata /*, though those who see here a case for *trikrama*, will give the *KP* as *parīto śiñcata /*, this latter being perhaps more acceptable, as it has been accepted in *RV.Prā.* X.3.

Similarly in the case of *vīrāsa etana maryāsaḥ* (5.61.4), *cit kambhānena skabhīyān* (10.111.5), and *yonim āraiga apa* (1.124.8), we have instances of *trikrama* according to one view<sup>32</sup>, but only *dvikrama* according to the other<sup>33</sup>. This option should be available in the case of *uṣā āvar tamaḥ* (1.92.4) and *yam ī garbham* (9.102.6) also. But *dvyabhikrama* is not admitted in the case of these passages, one does not know why? Why should *trikrama* alone be adopted in the case of these passages? This question is left unanswered<sup>34</sup>.

28. *RV.Prā.* XI.8 has only asked the question *ado pito so cid uṣar vasūyavo na dhakṣi dhukṣity api cātiyanti kim /*. But has supplied no answer to it. Only Uvaṭa appears to have supplied the answer in the following words: *itīmāni padāni — kiṁ kāraṇaṁ nātiyanti / imāny api hi tena tulyāni / satyam / kramaśāstre 'navasānīye 'nanugrhitānimāni / tasmān nātiyanti / tatra gṛhitānām iha hetur ucyate //*

29. This is but one of the several instances, which show the absence of unanimity (among Vedic *Paṇḍita*-s of the time) as regards the rules for the formation of the *KP*. Hence, we find *RV.Prā.* giving a general direction such as *ācaritaṁ tu notkramet / kramasya varitma smṛtisambhavau bruvaṁ samādhim asyānv itarāṇi kīrtayet //* *RV.Prā.* XI.63, and Uvaṭa thereon.

30. See *RV.Prā.* X.3; and XI.5.

31. Read: *tato' pare sandhyam avekṣya kāraṇaṁ tadarthajaṁ dvikramam atra kurvate //* *RV.Prā.* X.6; and Uvaṭa on it. *RV.Prā.* X.3, however, favours *trikrama* in this case, not *dvikrama*. Also see *RV.Prā.* XI.5.

32. See *RV.Prā.* X.3.

33. See *RV.Prā.* X.4; XI.10; and Uvaṭa on the same.

34. See *RV.Prā.* XI.12; and Uvaṭa thereon.



It may be thus seen that universally applicable rules regarding the acceptance of *dvikrama* or *bahukrama* had not as yet been fixed up. At least such appears to be the state of things reflected in the *RV.Prā.* XI.

Another instance of such diversity in the practice of the *KP.* may be found in what are known as the *anānupūrvya-saṁhitā-s*, which have been noted together in *RV.Prā.* II.78: *śunścic chepaṁ nīditam*<sup>35</sup>, *narā vā śaṁsaṁ pūṣaṇam*<sup>36</sup> / *narā cā śaṁsaṁ daivyam*<sup>37</sup> *tā anānupūrvya-sandhi* of *pada-s* proper is not clearly observable, because in them the *pada-s* themselves are intersected by a *pada* foreign to them. Hence to regularise matters we have to resort to *trikrama*<sup>38</sup>. So the *KP.* of these should be: *śunścicchepaṁ nīditam* (*trikrama*) and so on. But this again is not accepted by all. There are some who hold that in these cases we do see the (*varṇa*)*saṁdhi* among the *pada-s*; and hence, they argue, only *dvikrama*<sup>39</sup> should be adopted and not *trikrama*.

Yet another factor to be considered with reference to *KP.* is what is technically called *parigraha*<sup>40</sup>. We have already seen that, while preparing the *KP.*, some of the *pada-s* of the *Saṁ.* are not allowed to stand at the end of a *varga*. Such *pada-s*, because they stand between the first and the last *pada-s*, are designated *madhyagata pada-s*<sup>41</sup>. This clearly shows that they occur in the *KP.* only once; and cannot show the *saṁ.* and the *pada* forms both, which the *KP.* is expected to do. Only *Saṁ.* form being presented by these *pada-s*, something has to be done to put up their *pada* form. For, otherwise, the *KP.* will be defective to that extent. It is to supply this lacuna that the device called *parigraha* was invented by our Vedic *Pāṇḍita-s* of ancient India. *RV.Prā.* X.7-10 state which *pada-s* are to be shown by *parigraha*<sup>42</sup>.

A perusal of the cases of *parigraha* shows that it is a device to bring out clearly the *pada* form of a word, which in its absence is left unrepresented in the *KP.* Thus in such cases ordinarily the usual *krama* (part) will be made with the *Saṁ.* form of the word; and then the *parigraha* will be utilised to show its *pada* form. Take, for example, the word *purohitam* (in *RV* 1.1.1) which in the *PP.* is given as *poraḥ-hitam*. In *KP.*, the *varga* beginning with *purohitam* will read: *purohitam yajñ-sya*. But if we stop at this, only the *Saṁ.* form *purohitam* will be exhibited; and the *pada* form will go unrepresented. Hence we have to add the *parigraha* of this *pada*, which will be *purohitam iti puraḥ-hitam*.

35. 5.2.7.

36. 10.64.3.

37. 9.86.42.

38. See *RV.Prā.* XI.13; and Uvaṭa on it.

39. See *RV.Prā.* XI.14; and Uvaṭa on it.

40. See *RV.Prā.* III.20 where Uvaṭa has explained the distinction between *veṣṭika* and *parigraha*; also see *RV.Prā.* X. 20; XI.32, 36; and 45.

41. This is only another significant name for the *anavasānīya pada-s*. Cf. *bahukrame madhyagatāni* (*RV.Prā.* XI.25) and *bahumadhyagatāni* (*RV.Prā.* X.8).

42. Also see *RV.Prā.* XI.25; 27; 31-33.



Here we see the need for adding the *parigraha* in the case of a compound expression. And what is true of a compound *pada* is also true in all cases where *parigraha* has been enjoined.

*Parigraha*, as we know, is used in many other cases also. Thus, for example, it is prescribed in the case of a *bahukama varga*. In <sup>43</sup> all such cases the *RV.Prā.* lays down that the *varga* may be formed with three or even more *pada*-s as may be necessary, and then may be given the *parigraha* of each of the *madhyama pada*-s, whatever their number. Thus *vīrāsa etana maryāsaḥ* (5.61.4) will yield the *KP.* as *vīrāsa etana maryāsaḥ / itaneṭitana //*. Similarly, *cit kambhanena skabhīyān* (10.111.5) in *KP.* will read: *cit kambhanena skabhīyān / skambhaneneti skambhanena //*. Similar is the case with *yonim āraig apa* (1.124.8), of which the *KP.* will be: *yonim āraik apa / araig ity araik //*. Here we have to observe that we adopt *trikrama* giving the *madhyagata pada* in the *Sam.* form; and then how its *pada* form by means of *parigraha* in both of its parts.

It may, however, be observed that there is a triple option to this rule. In the first, the *KP.* of these passages is given in the usual *dvikrama varga*-s, both exhibiting the *Sam.* form only, of the *pada*-s which have been treated above as *madhya-gata pada*-s; and then showing their *pada* form by means of *parigraha* in both of its parts. The other two alternatives agree in avoiding *parigraha* altogether, and giving the *KP.* in two *dvikrama varga*-s only; and exhibiting both the *pada* and the *Sam.* forms within the *varga*-s themselves. Here two alternatives crop up owing to the fact that the maker or the reciter of the *KP.* is given the liberty to place the forms in either of the two *varga*-s according to his choice. Thus the alternative *KP.*-s of *vīrāsa etana maryāsaḥ* can be given as: (i) *vīrāsa etana / etana maryāsaḥ / itaneṭitana //*; (ii) *vīrāsa etana / itana maryasaḥ //*; and (iii) *vīrāsa itana / etana maryāsaḥ //*. This is enough to show how in such passages we are given first the choice of *trikrama* or *dvikrama*; and further, if we choose *dvikrama*, we are left free to use *parigraha* or dispense with it altogether; and finally, if we choose to do away with the *parigraha*, we are permitted to put the two forms in the two *varga*-s alternately according to our choice<sup>44</sup>.

Similar appears to be the case with the peculiar *saṁdhi*-s of the final *n* of a *pada*, resulting in: (i) *nakāralopa* (loss of *n*), (ii) *ūśma-bhāva*, and (iii) *ra-bhāva* respectively. In these cases<sup>45</sup>, the *saṁdhi*-s are retained in the actual *varga*; but are reduced to their *apetarāgā prakṛti* (unmodified original form) in the *parigraha*. This can be illustrated respectively as follows:

43. See *RV.Prā.* X.3; XI.10; also see XI.25.

44. For all these read: *RV.Prā.* XI.33; and *Uvaṭa* on it.

45. *RV.Prā.* XI.36 and *Uvaṭa* on it.

- (i) *nakāra-lopa*:  
*asmaasma it* (4.32.4) will in KP. be: *asmaasma it / asmānasmān*  
*ity asmān-asmān //*
- (ii) *nakārasyoṣmabhāvaḥ*:  
*svatavāḥ pāyuh* (4.2.6) will in KP. be: *svatavāḥ pāyuh / sva-*  
*tavān iti sva-tavān*
- (iii) *nakārasya rabhāvaḥ*:  
*abhīśūriva sārathiḥ* (6.57.6) in KP. will be: *abhīśūriva sārathiḥ /*  
*abhīśūnivyety abhīśūn-iva //*

In all these cases we see that in both the parts of the *parigraha*, the *saṁdhi*-s are removed and the words are reduced to their original forms. Similar is the case with other varieties of *saṁdhi* such as *nati*, *pluta*, and *upācarita*. Even in all these cases, however, an option is permitted by RV.Prā. XI. 45, by which the *Saṁdhi* is retained in the first part of the *parigraha*, but removed in the latter part of it. Thus the alternative KP. of the illustrations given above will be: *asmāasmā it / asmāasmā ity asmān-asmān //*; *svatavāḥ pāyuh / svatava iti sva-tavān //* and *abhīśūriva sārathiḥ / abhīśūr ivety abhīśūn-iva //*

It may be thus seen that in the RV.Prā. XI, which purports to supply the *hetu* (the reasoning) behind the particular rules (or rather practices observed) of the KP. has, in the course of its discussion and illustrations, placed before us as it were the varied details in the practice of the KP., every time supplying the reasoning behind them. RV.Prā. X, on the other hand, appears to have (if we go by Uvaṭa's commentary) rejected several of these rules, though even the author of the RV.Prā. appears to have been compelled to admit alternative practice in some cases at least, obviously because he must have found them prevailing in his day.

*Ārṣyavilopa*<sup>46</sup> appears to have been the main aim of the devisers of the KP.; and to achieve this aim, as we have seen, they have invented several devices. But what is exactly meant by this *ārṣyavilopa*? Literally it means not losing, not allowing the loss of, any part of the text derived from the *ṛṣi*-s, the seers of it. This naturally includes the idea of complete preservation of the original work of the *ṛṣi*-s as handed down by (oral) tradition. And this included the idea of the preservation of the PP. also, which appears to have been assigned equal sanctity.

It may be interesting to note that RV.Prā. has noticed two different views about this matter. There we find the rather roundabout expression, *anārṣyavilopa*<sup>47</sup>, which is explained by the simple word *ārṣivilopa*, which clearly signifies *vilopa* (loss) of the *ārṣi saṁhitā*, that is, the text as visualised by the *ṛṣi*-s, the inspired seers. To avoid this, one must

46. For *ārṣyavilopa* see RV.Prā. XI. 58; 59; also see RV.Prā. XI.1 where we find *ārṣyalopa* (which means the same thing).

47. (*svaravarnasamhitayor*) *anārṣyavilopa ucyate* / XI.58. This is explained by Uvaṭa as: *kim idam anārṣyavilopaḥ / ārṣivilopa ityārthaḥ /*

know how this *vilopa* (or loss of the *ārṣī*) comes about. The *RV.Prā.* has given us two views about it.

According to one view<sup>48</sup>, and this appears to be more strict and hence possibly the earlier one — the *ārṣī saṁhitā* has two aspects, namely the *varṇasaṁhitā* (coalescence of letters), and *svarasaṁhitā* (coalescence of accents). So, for a thorough preservation (*avilopa* in the strict sense of the term), retention intact of both the types of *saṁhitā* was absolutely necessary. Loss of either would amount to loss of the *ārṣī saṁhitā*.

But, as we already know, Vedic literature has at a very early (we may say even ancient) period tended to get loose in the matter of accent and ultimately a major portion of it has totally lost it. This slackness towards accentuation appears to have become particularly marked even before the day of *RV.Prā.*, as can be seen from the fact that it has noted an alternative view about *anārṣyavilopa* (of course, pertaining to *krama*). This is seen in the words *krameṣv anārṣaṇi buvate'pare svaram* (XI.58). From this we know that though there must have been a period when strict preservation of the *varṇa-* as well as the *svara- saṁhitā* was strictly preserved even in the *KP.*, the next period had already started during which strict preservation of the *svara- saṁhitā* was not scrupulously cared for. It is, however, interesting to find that the *RV.Prā.* bears witness to both these aspects of the *ārṣisaṁhitā* and consequently of *anārṣyavilopa* (= *ārṣīvilopa*)<sup>49</sup>.

Of these two types of *anārṣyavilopa*, Uvaṭa has given us good illustrations: *prā ṇa indo mahé* (9.44.1) in *KP.* will be: *prā ṇaḥ / na indo / indo mahé /*. Here we find that the first *varga* agrees exactly with the *Sam.* in letters as also in accentuation. So in it there is no loss (*lopa*) of either *svara-* or *varṇa-* (*saṁhitā*). But as we go further we see a different picture. In the following *varga-s* we notice the loss of accent in *indo*. For, in the *Sam.* its accent is *pracaya* (*anudātta* standing after *svarita*); but in the *KP.*, it has not been preserved. It is replaced by *anudātta*. So here the *ārṣī saṁhitā*, in the strict sense of the term, has not been preserved<sup>50</sup>.

But if we follow the other view which does not require the preservation of the *svara-saṁhitā*, provided that the *varṇa-saṁhitā* has been preserved all right, there is no loss of *ārṣī sam.* The *ārṣī sam.* is said to be well preserved.

Another aspect of this question is only slightly different. In the former the *lopa* is caused by the absence of the requisite *varṇa* or *svara*, or both. Here it is caused by the presence of something extraneous to, or not existing in, the original *Samhitā*. Thus *imāṁ me gaṅge*

48. See *RV.Prā.* XI.58 abc.

49. For these and the whole discussion on this topic see *RV.Prā.* XI.58-59. Also see *RV.Prā.* XI.47-58 for all cases of *ārṣīvilopa* in the absence of *bahukrama*.

50. See *RV.Prā.* XI.58 (Uvaṭa).

*yamune sarasvati śutudri stōmam* (10.75.5), in the usual mode of (*dvi-krama*) *KP.*, would cause loss of the existing accentuation of these *pada*-s and bring in also some accentuation not existing the original. This is the other virety of *ārṣivilopa*. In such cases the *KP.* will have to be formed with *varga*-s having a large number of *pada*-s, sven *pada*-s, for example, in the above passage<sup>51</sup>.

Similarly in some cases a *pada* may not show its *svara*; and a *padānta* may not show its correct *avasāna* in the *KP.*: as, for example, *tē'vadan* (10.109.1) and *nū itthā* (1.132.4) would in the *KP.* read *tē' vadan* and *nū itthā*; and not show the proper *svara* of *te* and the proper ending of *nu* unless it is shown by *parigraha*. Hence the *KP.* in these cases has to be *tē' vadan* / *tā iti té* / and *nū itthā* / *nvīti nū* / respectively<sup>52</sup>.

Again in cases like *āraik panthām* (1.113.16), *mo ṣū ṇaḥ* (1.173.12), and *prātaḥ somam* (7.41.1) to exhibit the exact form and accent of the *pada*-s, the device of *parigraha* has to be used<sup>53</sup>. And some have even gone to the extreme course of recommending the use of *nirvacana* (= *sthitopasthita*, or *parigraha*) of each and every *pada*<sup>54</sup>, though the author of the *RV.Prā.* has recommended that what is generally practiced should not be set aside<sup>55</sup>.

We are further told what (*Pāñcāla*), the son of *Babhrū*<sup>56</sup>, has said in this connection. *Pāñcāla*, the first propounder of *krama* (i.e. *KP.*), has declared that the *Krama-śāstra* as it has been taught in the beginning or at first (= in *Paṭala* X ?), should be considered to be correct or authentic (*sādhuvat*); what has been stated later again with a diversity of view (= in *Paṭala* XI ?) should not be so regarded<sup>57</sup>. The names given to these two *paṭala*-s also would seem to indicate their respective nature. Even after granting the position of the tenth *paṭala* vis-à-vis the eleventh *paṭala*, the fact remains that even the tenth *paṭala* appears to have noticed divergent practices in some cases at least. And if we

51. Read: *sa kāraṇāny ārṣyavilopavikramaḥ krameṇa yukto'pi bahūni saṁdadhat* // *RV.Prā.* XI.59 and Uvaṭa's commentary on it.

52. For these see Uvaṭa on *RV.Prā.* XI.60.

53. For these see Uvaṭa on *RV.Prā.* XI.61.

54. *krameta sarvāṇi padāni nirbruvann iti hi smaranti* / *RV.Prā.* XI.62.

55. *ācaritaḥ tu notkramet kramasya vartma smṛtisambhavau bruvan* / *samādhim asyānv itarāṇi kīrtayet* // *RV.Prā.* XI.63. The words *ācaritaḥ tu notkramet* seem to give an impression that the mode of *KP* had been already fixed and was well in practice also; and further that the reciter of the *KP* is exhorted not to swerve from the established norm that was in practice. Are we then to suppose that the *Krama-paṭala* gives us this norm? If so, what about the optional practices referred to in it? Tradition prevailing today, we are told, is absolutely unanimous! It has no cases of option at all.

56. Cf. *RV.Prā.* XI.65.

57. The general direction regarding this point is: *samādhim asyānv itarāṇi kīrtayet*. (Other points or cases should be decided in keeping with the teaching of the *krama-paṭala*). See *RV.Prā.* XI.63 and Uvaṭa's commentary giving its twofold interpretation.

stand by the authority of this *paṭala*, there are bound to be some variant *KP*-s in some cases at least, howsoever small they may be in number.

But our living tradition obtaining at the present day is so thoroughly unanimous, that there is no optional *KP*. at all in the whole of the *RV*. How shall we reconcile these two facts which stand directly opposed to one another? That there must have been divergent practices cannot be denied. That the *KP*. of the living tradition<sup>58</sup> today is uniform throughout the length and breadth of *Bharata* (India) is vouched for by our traditional *paṇḍita*-s. Therefore, the only conclusion which one may arrive at here can probably be that there must have been a great or extensive fermentation before the final fixation of the *KP*. of the *RV*.; and that this fermentation in its varied aspects we find reflected — whether wholly or partially we are not sure — in the *RV.Prā. XI*, which is known as the *Kramahetupaṭala*. We cannot say, in the present state of our knowledge, when the traditional *KP*. obtaining today came to be fixed, with a thorough rejection of all the optional cases or suggestions<sup>59</sup>.

The last interesting point to note as regards the *KP*. is the discussion and establishment of the utility of the *KP*. found towards the end of the *RV.Prā. XI*. The *prima facie* view in this respect starts with a frank and bold statement that *Krama* is of no use (*krameṇa nārthaḥ*) to one who is conversant with the *Saṁh.*- and the *Pada-pāṭha*-s. Other objections also are raised. But finally all the objections are refuted and the utility of the *KP*. is established in the concluding verses of the *kramahetu-paṭala*<sup>60</sup>. All this, together with the glimpses of the fermentation before the final fixation of the *KP*., seems to give an impression that there was a period when the *KP*. had not been unanimously accepted as being particularly authentic. But there can be no doubt as regards the important purpose served by it. On the one hand it unites into one work the two *pāṭha*-s of the *RV*. and serves as an efficient means for the preservation of the *RV Saṁhitā* and also the *PP*. But more important still is the fact that it serves as the basis of the so-called *vikṛti*-s which have greatly helped the thorough preservation of the Veda through ages, a fact which, though unbelievably wonderful, has yet to be admitted on the basis of the strict unanimity which is reportedly noticeable in the traditional recitation throughout the length and the breadth of *Bhārata* even today<sup>61</sup>.

58. For this information I am obliged to Vedamūrti Vināyak Bhaṭṭa Ghaisas (of Poona), popularly known as Ghaisas Gurujī.

59. It may, however, be noted that the *Upalekhasūtra*, which is of the nature of a manual of the *RV.KP*., appears to be wholly free from variant practices. This work, however, cannot be a work of high antiquity. See Abhyankar, *Devasthali: Vedavikṛtilakṣaṇa-saṁgraha*, BORI, 1978, Intr. p. XIV f. and foot-notes 3-5.

60. Read: *RV.Prā. XI.66-71*.

61. All unspecified references in this paper are to the *Ṛgveda-Saṁhitā*.